



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/830,176

04/21/2004

Joel D. Martz

3285A

7731

7590 11/14/2008
DAVID M. WARREN
655 OAKLAND AVE.
CEDARHURST, NY 11516

EXAMINER

SINGH, ARTI R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/830,176	Applicant(s) MARTZ, JOEL D.	
	Examiner Arti Singh	Art Unit 1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/29/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08/29/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended the claims to state that there is a difference in pore size between the two layers. This feature is seen in USPN 6074738 and is shown again below. This has already been shown and attested by the Board of Patent Appeal and Interferences, and thus the rejection below is restated and maintained. Applicant has filed an RCE and as a courtesy the Examiner is not making this action final, however, the Examiner maintains her position with the rejection set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1794

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6074738 issued to von Fragstein et al.

USPN 6074738 discloses a flexible laminate, which are especially, suited for water-resistant but water vapor permeable textile materials (column 1, lines 10-15). In the broadest aspects of the invention a microporous polymer layer (a) is adhered to an air impermeable polymer layer (b). The microporous layer has voids through the internal structure, which forms an interconnected continuous air path from one side to another. Both layers may chemically be the same, however in a preferred aspect the microporous polymer layer is polytetrafluoroethylene (column 2). Said layer can also be made of polyethylene or polyamide or polyesters (column 3, lines 47-53). The layer thicknesses, densities and pore size of the layers can vary depending upon the application (column 6, lines 43-45). In Example 11 the composite that is prepared is a microporous PTFE having a pore size of 0.25 microns and a weight of 20 g/m², which is coated with a polyurethane resin. This example combined with that of Example 3 indicate that the thickness of the microporous layer is a lot thicker than that of the coating layer. However, it is the position of the Examiner that thickness of the composite or its individual layers are all result effective variables and that optimizing the thickness of any of the layers would directly affect the strength of the laminate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to use a coating in the thickness of 0.5 –10 microns in the laminate of von Fragstein et al, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only

Art Unit: 1794

routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the present invention, one would have optimized the thickness of the coating layer to be 0.5-10 microns, motivated by the desire to obtain a composite that is flexible.

With regard to the ASTM test standards in claims 8-11, it is the position of the Examiner that if structurally and chemically the article is the same then testing it against any standard should provide the same test results and would be inherent to article.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arti Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-1483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/830,176
Art Unit: 1794

Page 5

/Arti Singh/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794

ars